

**Application No. 10/667,938**  
Amendment dated July 7, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2006

### **Remarks/Arguments**

This response addresses the examiner's office action dated February 8, 2006 with respect to the above-referenced application. This response includes a request for continued examination (RCE). Original claims 1 through 4 are pending in the case, but continue to be rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kolker*.

In the Applicants' response to the examiner's first office action, the Applicants maintained the originally presented claims and argued that the claims as filed were patentably distinct from the prior art. The examiner was not persuaded and made the second, now pending, office action *final*. In said final office action, the examiner observed that the Applicants should claim the specific connector and its shape that connects the components at the rear. On reflection, and considering the examiner's responses, the Applicants present amended claims which contain adjustments to each of the claims originally presented. The examiner will please note that in each of the claims additional limitations have been added to include the specific connector used in the invention, such connector being fully disclosed and fully illustrated in the application as originally filed.

It is respectfully suggested that with this change and limitation, the concerns the examiner noted with respect to the original claims reading on the prior art have been eliminated and allowable subject matter is now being presented.

### **Conclusions**

With the above, the Applicants respectfully suggest that they have presented argument which addresses the examiner's objections based on the specific prior art referenced. In view of the modifications offered and the amended claims now in the case, the Applicants request the examiner approve the issuance of a notice of


**Application No. 10/667,938**  
Amendment dated July 7, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of February 8, 2006

allowance in due course.

The Applicants believe that they have addressed all of the rejections, objections and other requirements of the examiner in the pending office action in good faith. However, in the event that the examiner may identify patentable subject matter but still requires additional prosecution in view of the presentation of this response, the examiner is most cordially invited to call the undersigned counsel at the examiner's convenience to discuss desirable additional amendments or changes to the extent necessary to place the case in condition for allowance. The Applicants thank the examiner for the time she has spent reviewing the present application.

Dated: July 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert B. Famiglio", is written over a horizontal line.

Robert B. Famiglio, Esquire  
Attorney for Applicants

**FAMIGLIO & ASSOCIATES**

USPTO ID# 29,305

P.O. Box 1999

Media, PA 19063

610-359-7300